

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Office for its remarks and observations, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2. **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2003/0217034 ("Schutt") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,775,537 ("Panichkul"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 describes a matter-centric document management system (DMS) that includes:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type;

an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type; and

a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders."

While Schutt does describe a search function, there is no teaching in Schutt that user formulated queries can be saved to a matter file.

The Office relies on Panichkul, col. 8, lines 15-55 as teaching or suggesting: "a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders."

The cited teaching from Panichkul describes a search query memory in a mobile device wherein a user is able to save a search query to the search query memory to re-run at a later time. A listing of the saved searches is displayed and the user selects from the list to re-run a search query. There is, however, no teaching or suggestion in Panichkul of a matter file or of saving user-formulated queries to a matter file, nor of

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

"wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders."

Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of Schutt and Panichkul of a matter centric document system that includes each and every element described in claim 1, including a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders." The present rejection is therefore deemed improper. The foregoing remarks apply equally to claim 16.

In view of their dependence from allowable parent claims, the dependent claims are allowable over the combination without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claims 1-2 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 20030163490 ("Kitamura") in view of Panichkul. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner acknowledges that there is no teaching or suggestion in Kitamura of a matter-centric document system that includes the elements:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type;

an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type; and

a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders."

As applicant has previously demonstrated, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed subject matter in Panichkul, either. Accordingly, because the combination fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention, the present rejection is deemed to be improper. The above remarks apply equally to claim 16. In view of their dependence from allowable parent claims, the dependent claims are deemed allowable over the combination without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claim 4 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,127,676 ("Linsey"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 6-7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,269,369 ("Robertson"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,369,840 ("Barnett"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2003/0115270 ("Funk"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0049727 ("Rothkop"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,401,097 ("McCotter"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,864,865 ("Lakis"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 3 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Schutt. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Linsey. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,245 ("Huang"). In view of the foregoing, the

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Barnett. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Funk. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Rothkop. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of McCotter. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Lakis. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

Claims 16-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Panichkul and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0169650 ("Dougherty"). In view of the foregoing, the present rejection is deemed improper.

3. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. As such, Applicant earnestly requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner deem it helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862

Page 10 of 10